

# Attitudes of Farmers Toward Cooperative Marketing

George F. Henning and Earl B. Poling



OHIO  
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION  
Wooster, Ohio

## CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Type, Extent, and Nature of Study .....                                | 3  |
| Marketing Outlets Used by Farmers Interviewed .....                    | 4  |
| Kinds and Types of Farmers .....                                       | 9  |
| Early Experience with Cooperative Livestock Marketing .....            | 11 |
| Knowledge Farmers Had of Their Cooperative Livestock Association ..... | 15 |
| Information Farmers Receive Concerning Their Cooperative .....         | 19 |
| Publications and Letters .....   | 20 |
| Personal Contact—Field Service .....                                   | 24 |
| Livestock Meetings .....   | 25 |
| Radio .....  | 28 |
| What Information Farmers Would Like to Receive .....                   | 29 |
| Evaluation of the Association by Farmers .....                         | 30 |
| Suggestions and Criticisms .....                                       | 32 |
| Conclusion .....   | 35 |

This page intentionally blank.

# ATTITUDES OF FARMERS TOWARD COOPERATIVE MARKETING

GEORGE F. HENNING AND EARL B. POLING

## TYPE, EXTENT, AND NATURE OF STUDY

Cooperative marketing of livestock in Ohio began to develop and expand during the period 1919-1922. Many associations were organized, some at local community shipping points and others covering an entire county. By 1925 there had been organized cooperative agencies to sell livestock on the important markets at Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh. These have continued successfully in operation as cooperatives. Because of improved highways, increased motor transportation, the increase in direct buying of livestock by slaughterers, and the establishment of livestock auctions, most of the local and county cooperatives that were engaged in the assembling of livestock declined in importance and many ceased operations by 1935. However, the cooperatives engaged in the selling of livestock to packers continued to expand. These are the cooperatives functioning at the time of this study.

Realizing that the attitude of farmers, patrons as well as nonpatrons, toward the cooperative is of importance, the Department of Rural Economics of the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station decided to obtain from livestock producers their attitude toward cooperative livestock marketing. After discussion with leaders familiar with cooperative livestock marketing and its problems, areas were selected that were thought to be representative of livestock farmers. The areas chosen for study were: four counties near Cincinnati; a section surrounding Columbus; Pickaway County; a section southwest of Cleveland; and Auglaize County. In the Cincinnati area four counties, Butler, Preble, Clinton, and Highland, were chosen. Farmers who had patronized the producers' livestock association at Cincinnati were used as a basis for interviews. Every tenth shipper of the group of patrons was taken, and these were located over the different counties and visited by interviewers. In the Cincinnati area 131 were so chosen and interviewed. In the other areas no such list was available; consequently, representative farmers well scattered over the territory were selected and interviewed. In the Pickaway County area, 50 were so chosen; in the Columbus area, 54; in the Cleveland area, 71; and in Auglaize County, 20.

The Columbus area included Franklin County, a portion of Union County, the southern one-fourth of Delaware County, part of southwestern Licking and northwestern Fairfield Counties. The Cleveland area included Ashland County, southwestern Wayne, and northwestern Holmes Counties.

In this study each man was interviewed personally at his farm. His knowledge of cooperative marketing, his information concerning it, and his opinion and attitude toward livestock marketing, and cooperative livestock marketing in particular, were obtained. It should be remembered that most of the men interviewed were acquainted only with cooperative organizations operating in their community. Very few had a broad knowledge covering many counties.

## MARKETING OUTLETS USED BY FARMERS INTERVIEWED

The farmers interviewed during the 12 months preceding the study marketed 1,970 cattle, 1,710 calves, 18,048 hogs, and 3,533 sheep. This information is given in table 1. You will note from this same table the amount of livestock of each species that went to the various outlets. There was much difference between the species. Of the cattle, the largest percentage was moved through livestock dealers. In the case of calves, hogs, and sheep, however, the terminal cooperative for the five combined areas was the most important of any one outlet used by the various farmers. The largest percentage obtained by the cooperatives was in sheep and lambs. For all four species, however, selling the livestock to dealers was a very important outlet among the farmers that were interviewed in this study. The auction was not so important for sheep and hogs as for calves and cattle. It must be remembered, however, that 131 of these farmers lived in the Cincinnati territory and 74 in the Cleveland area; naturally this study is weighted somewhat heavily with farmers who sell their livestock on terminal markets.

TABLE 1.—Livestock market outlets used by the farmers who were interviewed, in the five areas combined

|                            | Number |        |        |       | Percentage |        |       |       |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|-------|
|                            | Cattle | Calves | Hogs   | Sheep | Cattle     | Calves | Hogs  | Sheep |
| Terminal cooperative ..... | 351    | 493    | 5,473  | 1,547 | 17.8       | 28.8   | 30.3  | 43.8  |
| Terminal independent ..... | 57     | 141    | 976    | 250   | 2.9        | 8.2    | 5.4   | 7.1   |
| Cooperative auction .....  | 231    | 262    | 1,361  | 159   | 11.7       | 15.3   | 7.5   | 4.5   |
| Independent auction .....  | 167    | 230    | 1,179  | 328   | 8.5        | 13.5   | 6.5   | 9.3   |
| Other cooperatives .....   | 90     | 70     | 1,006  | 199   | 4.6        | 4.1    | 5.6   | 5.6   |
| Livestock dealers .....    | 580    | 282    | 5,978  | 856   | 29.4       | 16.5   | 33.2  | 24.2  |
| Direct to packers .....    | 268    | 115    | 1,780  | 72    | 13.6       | 6.7    | 9.9   | 2.0   |
| Local butchers .....       | 122    | 41     | 71     | ..... | 6.2        | 2.5    | .4    | ..... |
| Farmers .....              | 104    | 76     | 224    | 122   | 5.3        | 4.4    | 1.2   | 3.5   |
| Total .....                | 1,970  | 1,710  | 18,048 | 3,533 | 100.0      | 100.0  | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Cooperative .....          | 672    | 825    | 7,840  | 1,905 | 34.1       | 48.2   | 43.4  | 53.9  |
| Otherwise .....            | 1,298  | 885    | 10,208 | 1,628 | 65.9       | 51.8   | 56.6  | 46.1  |
| Total .....                | 1,970  | 1,710  | 18,048 | 3,533 | 100.0      | 100.0  | 100.0 | 100.0 |

An analysis of table 1 gives a fair picture of the methods and outlets used by farmers interviewed in this study. At the bottom of table 1 we have combined the cooperative volume for the same group of farmers. Here you will note that 34.1 per cent of cattle, 48.2 per cent of calves, 43.4 per cent of hogs, and 53.9 per cent of the sheep moved through cooperative channels. This would show that of the 326 farmers interviewed, more were marketing their livestock cooperatively than was true of the average farmer in Ohio. The percentage will not run that high for the State as a whole.

The information presented in table 2 shows more in detail the information given in the preceding table. It analyzes the outlets used by the farmers interviewed for the respective areas. In table 1 the percentage by species was given for the entire five areas. Table 2 divides these percentages by respective sections. A rather careful analysis of table 2 shows that marketing cooperatively in the Cincinnati and Cleveland areas was primarily through the terminal located on those markets, whereas in the Pickaway, Columbus, and Auglaize areas most of the cooperative activity was through the cooperative auction.

TABLE 2.—Livestock market outlets used by the farmers who were interviewed, for each area separately

|                            | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                            | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| <b>Cattle:</b>             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Terminal cooperative ..... | 28.7        | .....       | 30.4        | 10.7        | .....       | 17.8        |
| Terminal independent ..... | 6.3         | .....       | 2.8         | .....       | .....       | 2.9         |
| Cooperative auction .....  | .....       | 23.8        | .....       | 25.5        | 25.7        | 11.7        |
| Independent auction .....  | 12.1        | .....       | 8.1         | 2.8         | 8.6         | 8.5         |
| Other cooperatives .....   | 1.5         | 4.8         | .....       | 7.2         | 10.3        | 4.6         |
| Livestock dealers .....    | 37.2        | 23.8        | 17.7        | 36.1        | 18.6        | 29.4        |
| Direct to packers .....    | .3          | 12.7        | 18.7        | 11.3        | 35.3        | 13.6        |
| Farmers .....              | 4.7         | 9.5         | 11.0        | 5.9         | 1.5         | 5.3         |
| Local butchers .....       | 9.2         | 25.4        | 11.3        | .5          | .....       | 6.2         |
| Total .....                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....         | 780         | 63          | 283         | 388         | 456         | 1,970       |
| Total cooperative .....    | 30.2        | 28.6        | 30.4        | 43.4        | 36.0        | 34.1        |
| <b>Calves:</b>             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Terminal cooperative ..... | 41.6        | .....       | 42.1        | 13.1        | .....       | 28.9        |
| Terminal independent ..... | 11.8        | .....       | 15.5        | .....       | 1.3         | 8.3         |
| Cooperative auction .....  | .....       | 32.3        | .....       | 27.9        | 73.9        | 15.3        |
| Independent auction .....  | 17.1        | .....       | 25.0        | 3.9         | 3.0         | 13.5        |
| Other cooperatives .....   | 5.3         | 22.5        | .....       | 2.3         | .6          | 4.1         |
| Livestock dealers .....    | 12.9        | 42.2        | 6.2         | 25.6        | 17.6        | 16.5        |
| Direct to packers .....    | 7.2         | .....       | 9.8         | 7.3         | .6          | 6.7         |
| Farmers .....              | 2.9         | 2.0         | 1.4         | 11.5        | 3.0         | 4.4         |
| Local butchers .....       | 1.2         | 1.0         | .....       | 8.4         | .....       | 2.3         |
| Total .....                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....         | 692         | 102         | 368         | 383         | 165         | 1,710       |
| Total cooperative .....    | 46.9        | 54.8        | 42.1        | 43.3        | 74.5        | 48.3        |
| <b>Hogs:</b>               |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Terminal cooperative ..... | 39.7        | .....       | 39.4        | 30.0        | 1.0         | 30.4        |
| Terminal independent ..... | 6.9         | .....       | 22.3        | .....       | .....       | 5.4         |
| Cooperative auction .....  | .....       | 26.3        | .....       | .....       | 40.7        | 7.5         |
| Independent auction .....  | 6.9         | .....       | 21.0        | 4.9         | 2.7         | 6.5         |
| Other cooperatives .....   | 3.2         | 20.6        | .....       | 2.2         | 15.8        | 5.6         |
| Livestock dealers .....    | 36.8        | 50.3        | 5.1         | 25.3        | 34.0        | 33.1        |
| Direct to packers .....    | 4.7         | 2.8         | 6.8         | 36.7        | 5.3         | 9.9         |
| Farmers .....              | 1.3         | .....       | 4.0         | .9          | .5          | 1.2         |
| Local butchers .....       | .5          | .....       | 1.4         | .....       | .....       | .4          |
| Total .....                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....         | 10,508      | 727         | 1,113       | 2,822       | 2,878       | 18,048      |
| Total cooperative .....    | 42.9        | 46.9        | 39.4        | 32.2        | 57.5        | 43.5        |
| <b>Sheep:</b>              |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Terminal cooperative ..... | 47.7        | .....       | 56.1        | 56.5        | .....       | 43.8        |
| Terminal independent ..... | 4.0         | .....       | 20.3        | .....       | .....       | 7.1         |
| Cooperative auction .....  | .....       | .5          | .....       | 3.7         | 32.9        | 4.5         |
| Independent auction .....  | 16.2        | .....       | 3.9         | 4.3         | 14.0        | 9.3         |
| Other cooperatives .....   | 8.3         | 38.1        | .....       | 1.2         | 3.5         | 5.6         |
| Livestock dealers .....    | 18.8        | 40.2        | 16.2        | 27.4        | 48.1        | 24.2        |
| Direct to packers .....    | 3.5         | .....       | .....       | 3.0         | 1.5         | 2.0         |
| Farmers .....              | 1.5         | 21.2        | 3.5         | 3.9         | .....       | 3.5         |
| Local butchers .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       |
| Total .....                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....         | 1,263       | 189         | 986         | 694         | 401         | 3,533       |
| Total cooperative .....    | 56.0        | 38.6        | 56.1        | 61.4        | 36.4        | 53.9        |

In the Columbus area a larger percentage of livestock than in any of the areas moved from the farmer through livestock dealers. The next largest percentage was in the Cincinnati area, and the smallest percentage was in the Cleveland area. More livestock moved through the auction system of marketing in the Pickaway, Columbus, Cleveland, and Auglaize areas.

Table 2 shows the market outlets used by farmers in the five areas studied in Ohio for each of the four species. It is interesting to note another analysis of how the same livestock was marketed. The volume was divided into three groups: those farmers who marketed all their livestock through cooperative agencies; those who marketed part of their livestock cooperatively and part through noncooperative channels; and those farmers who marketed none of their livestock cooperatively. These three groups have been designated as "all cooperative", "part cooperative", and "none cooperative", and will carry this same designation throughout the study.

In looking at table 3 you will note that of all the cattle marketed, 20 per cent were marketed by the "all cooperative" group and 33 per cent by the "none cooperative" group. For calves, a higher percentage was marketed by those farmers who placed all their calves through cooperative channels. You will note that this was the highest percentage of all species—27 per cent.

**TABLE 3.—The number and percentage of livestock marketed during the past 12 months by those farmers who marketed all, part, or none of their livestock cooperatively, in the five Ohio areas combined**

|             | Number marketing— |            |            |        | Percentage marketing— |            |            |       |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|------------|--------|-----------------------|------------|------------|-------|
|             | All coop.         | Part coop. | None coop. | Total  | All coop.             | Part coop. | None coop. | Total |
| Cattle..... | 387               | 932        | 651        | 1,970  | 19.6                  | 47.3       | 33.1       | 100.0 |
| Calves..... | 471               | 778        | 461        | 1,710  | 27.5                  | 45.5       | 27.0       | 100.0 |
| Hogs.....   | 3,870             | 9,570      | 4,608      | 18,048 | 21.4                  | 53.1       | 25.5       | 100.0 |
| Sheep.....  | 915               | 1,812      | 806        | 3,533  | 25.9                  | 51.3       | 22.8       | 100.0 |

With some difference between the species, the farmers who marketed "none cooperative" were about of the same importance for volume marketed as the "all cooperative" group. The most important group from the standpoint of volume, however, was that group of farmers who marketed part cooperatively and part through noncooperative channels. This latter group marketed about half of the volume of livestock and did not vary greatly between species.

When the three main groups of farmers for the different areas are analyzed, there is found the same general tendency applying to each area that applied to the combined five areas (table 4). In cattle, the "all cooperative" group was largest for Columbus and smallest for Auglaize County. In calves, the largest "all cooperative" group was Pickaway County and the smallest was Cleveland; for sheep, the Cincinnati area had the largest "all cooperative" group and Auglaize the smallest; for hogs, Pickaway was largest and Auglaize smallest in the "all cooperative" group. These facts point out that the Auglaize area had the lowest volume that was marketed by those farmers sending all their livestock to the cooperative. The largest noncooperative group was in the Cleveland area for cattle, calves, and hogs and in Pickaway County for sheep. The in-between, or intermediate, group, which sent part of its livestock to the cooperative and part elsewhere, was largest in the Cincinnati and Auglaize areas for cattle, the Auglaize area for calves and hogs, and the Auglaize and Columbus areas for sheep.

TABLE 4.—The percentage of livestock marketed during the past 12 months by those farmers who marketed all, part, or none of their livestock cooperatively, in five Ohio areas, by species

|                          | Cincinnati | Auglaize | Cleveland | Columbus | Pickaway | Total  |
|--------------------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|--------|
| <b>Cattle:</b>           |            |          |           |          |          |        |
| All cooperatively .....  | 17.2       | 3.2      | 12.7      | 28.1     | 23.2     | 19.6   |
| Part cooperatively ..... | 66.4       | 61.9     | 30.7      | 38.1     | 30.7     | 47.3   |
| None cooperatively ..... | 16.4       | 34.9     | 56.6      | 33.8     | 46.1     | 33.1   |
| Total per cent. ....     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 100.0     | 100.0    | 100.0    | 100.0  |
| Total number. ....       | 780        | 63       | 283       | 388      | 456      | 1,970  |
| <b>Calves:</b>           |            |          |           |          |          |        |
| All cooperatively .....  | 32.1       | 17.6     | 13.9      | 25.1     | 50.9     | 27.5   |
| Part cooperatively ..... | 49.1       | 62.8     | 44.0      | 37.6     | 41.2     | 45.5   |
| None cooperatively ..... | 18.8       | 19.6     | 42.1      | 37.3     | 7.9      | 27.0   |
| Total per cent. ....     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 100.0     | 100.0    | 100.0    | 100.0  |
| Total number. ....       | 692        | 102      | 368       | 383      | 165      | 1,710  |
| <b>Hogs:</b>             |            |          |           |          |          |        |
| All cooperatively .....  | 21.1       | 12.4     | 16.0      | 20.7     | 27.9     | 21.4   |
| Part cooperatively ..... | 59.5       | 63.8     | 37.9      | 37.4     | 47.9     | 53.0   |
| None cooperatively ..... | 19.4       | 23.8     | 46.1      | 41.9     | 24.2     | 25.6   |
| Total per cent. ....     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 100.0     | 100.0    | 100.0    | 100.0  |
| Total number. ....       | 10,508     | 727      | 1,113     | 2,822    | 2,878    | 18,048 |
| <b>Sheep:</b>            |            |          |           |          |          |        |
| All cooperatively .....  | 35.0       | 7.9      | 21.8      | 21.5     | 23.4     | 25.9   |
| Part cooperatively ..... | 52.0       | 63.5     | 44.9      | 68.3     | 29.4     | 51.3   |
| None cooperatively ..... | 13.0       | 28.6     | 33.3      | 10.2     | 47.2     | 22.8   |
| Total per cent. ....     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 100.0     | 100.0    | 100.0    | 100.0  |
| Total number. ....       | 1,263      | 189      | 986       | 694      | 401      | 3,533  |

In the previous tables there have been shown the percentage of livestock marketed cooperatively, part cooperatively, and noncooperatively, and the outlets used by this selected group of farmers in marketing their livestock. In table 5 are shown the reasons for using different outlets given by the farmers in the five areas.

The farmers who marketed cooperatively all their livestock stated that they were influenced principally by three factors: first, they received better prices through the cooperative; second, they were satisfied with the cooperative; and third, they believed that the cooperative should be supported.

In the group who marketed part cooperatively, the two factors influencing their choice most were a better market at another place and convenience in selling elsewhere. In the Columbus area, 40 per cent of the farmers marketing part cooperatively indicated that they were satisfied with cooperative marketing. Twenty-seven per cent of those marketing part cooperatively in the Columbus area said they had a better market by selling direct to packers. In the Pickaway area 40 per cent of those marketing part cooperatively indicated that they were satisfied with cooperative marketing. Convenience in selling some place other than through a cooperative influenced 18 per cent of those in this area.

The group of farmers that marketed none of their livestock through a cooperative said the important factors influencing their choice of a market were a better market at some place other than a cooperative and more convenience in selling elsewhere. These two factors were important in every area in influencing the "none cooperative" group. In the Auglaize area, 50 per cent of those



marketing noncooperatively said they liked to sell at home rather than through a cooperative. In the Columbus area, 28 per cent of those marketing noncooperatively said they had a better market direct to packers.

**TABLE 5.—Factors influencing farmers who were interviewed in marketing their livestock during the past 12 months, for those farmers who marketed all, part, or none of their livestock cooperatively, in five Ohio areas**

| Factor   | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| <b>All cooperative:</b>                            |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Satisfied with cooperative service.....            | 36.2        | 33.3        | 72.7        | 21.4        | 6.7         | 33.3        |
| Believe in supporting cooperative.....             | 40.4        | 33.4        | 18.2        | 42.9        | 6.7         | 32.2        |
| Obtain better prices through cooperative.....      | 8.5         | 33.3        | 9.1         | 35.7        | 73.3        | 24.5        |
| Other reasons.....                                 | 6.4         |             |             |             | 6.7         | 4.4         |
| No answer.....                                     | 8.5         |             |             |             | 6.6         | 5.6         |
| Total per cent.....                                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....                                  | 47          | 3           | 11          | 14          | 15          | 90          |
| <b>Part cooperative:</b>                           |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Better market elsewhere....                        | 37.0        | 53.9        | 28.0        | 4.6         | 9.1         | 27.9        |
| Convenient to sell elsewhere.....                  | 30.8        | 15.4        | 32.0        | 9.1         | 18.1        | 24.5        |
| Obtain better price through cooperative.....       |             |             |             | 13.6        | 40.8        | 8.2         |
| Satisfied with cooperative service.....            | 1.5         |             |             | 27.2        | 4.6         | 5.4         |
| Truck driver took elsewhere.....                   | 4.6         |             | 12.0        |             | 9.1         | 5.4         |
| Like to sell at home.....                          | 4.6         | 7.7         | 8.0         | 4.6         | 4.6         | 5.4         |
| Dissatisfied with grades, price, and services..... | 10.8        |             |             |             |             | 4.8         |
| Better market to packers direct.....               |             |             | 4.0         | 27.2        |             | 4.8         |
| Wanted to try different method.....                | 1.5         |             | 4.0         |             | 4.6         | 2.0         |
| Believe in supporting cooperative.....             | 1.5         |             |             | 4.6         |             | 1.4         |
| Other reasons.....                                 | 1.5         | 23.0        | 12.0        | 9.1         | 9.1         | 7.5         |
| No answer.....                                     | 6.2         |             |             |             |             | 2.7         |
| Total per cent.....                                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....                                  | 65          | 13          | 25          | 22          | 22          | 147         |
| <b>None cooperative:</b>                           |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Better market elsewhere....                        | 58.1        | 50.0        | 34.3        | 3.6         | 69.2        | 37.9        |
| Convenient to market elsewhere.....                | 16.1        |             | 31.4        | 32.1        | 7.7         | 23.4        |
| Like to sell at home.....                          | 9.7         | 50.0        | 2.9         | 17.9        | 7.7         | 10.8        |
| Better market to packers direct.....               |             |             |             | 28.6        | 7.7         | 8.1         |
| Truck driver took elsewhere.....                   | 3.2         |             | 8.6         | 7.1         |             | 5.4         |
| Wanted to try different methods.....               |             |             | 5.7         |             |             | 1.8         |
| Dissatisfied with grades, price, and services..... | 3.2         |             |             |             |             | .9          |
| Other reasons.....                                 | 6.5         |             | 14.2        | 10.7        | 7.7         | 9.9         |
| No answer.....                                     | 3.2         |             | 2.9         |             |             | 1.8         |
| Total per cent.....                                | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....                                  | 31          | 4           | 35          | 28          | 13          | 111         |
| <b>Grand total.....</b>                            | <b>143</b>  | <b>20</b>   | <b>71</b>   | <b>64</b>   | <b>50</b>   | <b>348</b>  |

Table 5 brings out the fact that all farmers do not see things in exactly the same way. On one side a group of farmers indicated that they had obtained better prices or been satisfied with the cooperative, whereas on the other side a slightly larger group stated that they had a better market other than the cooperative. This seems contradictory, and it would be, except for the fact that all

farmers do not see and think alike. There is also the possibility that the grade and quality are such that the cooperative method may be better for some farmers, whereas for others it might not be so suitable. When many factors, as listed in table 5, are influencing farmers in marketing their livestock, it becomes apparent that the cooperative agency has to be on a high plane of service and performance in order to get a large volume of livestock from the farmers in the respective areas.

#### KINDS AND TYPES OF FARMERS

Since this study is an analysis of farmers' attitudes toward marketing, and especially cooperative marketing, it is interesting to note the kinds and types of farmers interviewed. In such a study of farmers who may or may not believe in cooperation, let us observe first those who have membership in farm organizations (table 6).

**TABLE 6.—Membership in farm organizations by those farmers who marketed all, part, or none of their livestock cooperatively, in five Ohio areas combined**

|  | Those reporting |            |            |            |              |              |              |              |
|--|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|  | Number          |            |            |            | Percentage   |              |              |              |
|  | All coop.       | Part coop. | None coop. | Total      | All coop.    | Part coop.   | None coop.   | Total        |
| <b>Organization:</b>                   |                 |            |            |            |              |              |              |              |
| Farm Bureau .....                      | 31              | 46         | 18         | 95         | 37.8         | 32.4         | 17.7         | 29.1         |
| Grange .....                           | 9               | 12         | 3          | 24         | 11.0         | 8.5          | 2.9          | 7.3          |
| Both Farm Bureau and Grange .....      | 6               | 7          | 3          | 16         | 7.2          | 4.9          | 2.9          | 4.8          |
| Farmers' Union .....                   | 1               | 3          | 5          | 9          | 1.2          | 2.1          | 4.9          | 2.8          |
| Farm Bureau and Milk Association ..... | 1               | 2          | 3          | 6          | 1.2          | 1.4          | 2.9          | 1.8          |
| Milk cooperative .....                 | 2               | 2          | 1          | 3          | 2.4          | 1.4          | 1.0          | .9           |
| Other organizations .....              | 1               | 1          | 3          | 5          | .7           | .7           | 3.0          | 1.8          |
| No answer .....                        | 1               | 1          | .....      | 2          | 1.2          | .7           | .....        | .3           |
| <b>Total having membership .....</b>   | <b>51</b>       | <b>74</b>  | <b>36</b>  | <b>161</b> | <b>62.2</b>  | <b>52.1</b>  | <b>35.3</b>  | <b>49.4</b>  |
| <b>No organization:</b>                |                 |            |            |            |              |              |              |              |
| Formerly Grange .....                  | 2               | 2          | 2          | 6          | 2.5          | 1.4          | 2.0          | 1.8          |
| Formerly Farm Bureau .....             | 5               | 12         | 8          | 25         | 6.1          | 8.5          | 7.7          | 7.7          |
| Formerly Equity Union .....            | 1               | .....      | 1          | 1          | .....        | .....        | 1.0          | .3           |
| Formerly Farm Bureau and Grange .....  | 1               | 3          | 2          | 6          | 1.2          | 2.1          | 2.0          | 1.8          |
| None .....                             | 23              | 51         | 53         | 127        | 28.0         | 35.9         | 52.0         | 39.0         |
| <b>Total without membership .....</b>  | <b>31</b>       | <b>68</b>  | <b>66</b>  | <b>165</b> | <b>37.8</b>  | <b>47.9</b>  | <b>64.7</b>  | <b>50.6</b>  |
| <b>Total farmers .....</b>             | <b>82</b>       | <b>142</b> | <b>102</b> | <b>326</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Of the 326 farmers interviewed, 29 per cent belonged to the Farm Bureau alone, and 7.3 per cent belonged to the Grange only. An additional 4.8 per cent belonged to both the Farm Bureau and Grange. There were various kinds of membership in farm organizations by these farmers. Some held membership only in some local cooperative. Altogether, there were just about half of the farmers interviewed who had membership in some commodity cooperative or some farmer organization such as the Farm Bureau, Grange, or Farmers' Union. This would indicate that we were talking to a group of farmers who were predominantly farm organization minded.

Of the group marketing "all cooperative", 62 per cent were members of some cooperative or were associated with some farm organization; whereas of the "none cooperative" group, only 35 per cent were members of some farm

organization. Both groups had about the same percentage of farmers who were former members of some farm organization or cooperative. Thus, it would seem that cooperative performance is associated with membership in farm organizations or other cooperatives.

Table 7 is presented to give additional information on the kind and type of farmers interviewed. Two classifications were made, landowners and tenants. Of the group included in this analysis, the owners numbered 245 and the tenants, 81.

**TABLE 7.—The percentage of farmers by owners and tenants who marketed all, part, or none of their livestock cooperatively, in five Ohio areas**

| Area                              | How marketing |          |            |          |            |          | Total      |          |         |          |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|
|                                   | All coop.     |          | Part coop. |          | None coop. |          | Percentage |          | Number  |          |
|                                   | Own-ers       | Ten-ants | Own-ers    | Ten-ants | Own-ers    | Ten-ants | Own-ers    | Ten-ants | Own-ers | Ten-ants |
| Cincinnati.....                   | 25.3          | 46.9     | 51.5       | 34.4     | 23.2       | 18.7     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 99      | 32       |
| Auglaize.....                     | 6.3           | 50.0     | 68.7       | 50.0     | 25.0       | .....    | 100.0      | 100.0    | 16      | 4        |
| Cleveland.....                    | 14.6          | 18.8     | 34.5       | 37.5     | 50.9       | 43.7     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 55      | 16       |
| Columbus.....                     | 20.0          | 35.7     | 35.0       | 42.9     | 45.0       | 21.4     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 40      | 14       |
| Pickaway.....                     | 28.6          | 33.3     | 54.3       | 20.0     | 17.1       | 46.7     | 100.0      | 100.0    | 35      | 15       |
| All areas combin-<br>ed.....      | 21.2          | 37.0     | 46.5       | 34.6     | 32.3       | 28.4     | 100.0      | 100.0    | .....   | .....    |
| Total number of<br>all areas..... | 52            | 30       | 114        | 28       | 79         | 23       | .....      | .....    | 245     | 81       |

This relationship of owners to tenants is somewhat larger than is shown by the 1935 census for these same areas, in so far as a direct comparison could be made. The difference is not great, although the sample should have about 15 or 20 more tenants to correspond with the percentage as given in the census. The significant part of table 7 shows that the "all cooperative" group contained a larger percentage of tenants. This was true for all the areas.

In the group marketing part to cooperatives and part to other agencies there was shown a larger percentage of owners than tenants. The same situation existed in the "none cooperative" group, although the percentage spread between the owner and tenant classes was not as great as in the "part cooperative" group.

This analysis may mean that tenants are apt to be more cooperative minded than owners and that owners are more individualistic and, hence, less interested in cooperation.

When the groups were analyzed by the number of years in residence on the same farm, there was found to be a slight tendency for those farmers who had lived on their farms only a few years to be somewhat more interested in cooperation. This seemed to be true for all the areas except Pickaway. The tendency, however, is so slight that it is not of enough importance for further mention in this study.

A further analysis of this group of 326 farmers reveals that 136, or 51.7 per cent, had membership in some livestock cooperative association (table 8). The highest percentage of membership in the livestock cooperatives was found in the Cincinnati area and the lowest in the Cleveland and Pickaway areas. This probably means that the Cleveland and Pickaway associations are not

checking closely on the membership in their operations. In the Cincinnati area, there were a large number of members because refunds have been made from year to year and patrons must be members in order to participate in the patronage dividends. The other areas have not made refunds in recent years and have not made as much effort to get members as has the Cincinnati cooperative organization.

TABLE 8.—Percentage and years of membership of farmers having membership in livestock cooperative marketing association, in five Ohio areas

| Years a member              | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                             | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| 1-3 .....                   | 27.4        | 40.0        | 14.1        | 5.5         | 2.0         | 17.8        |
| 4-6 .....                   | 11.5        |             | 5.6         | 3.6         |             | 6.4         |
| 7-9 .....                   | 3.8         |             |             | 1.9         |             | 1.8         |
| 10-12 .....                 | 11.5        |             | 2.8         | 11.1        | 2.0         | 7.5         |
| 13-15 .....                 |             |             |             | 1.9         |             | .3          |
| 15-over .....               |             |             |             |             | 2.0         | .3          |
| Since beginning .....       | 3.8         |             |             |             | 2.0         | 1.8         |
| Do not know .....           | 3.8         |             |             |             |             | 1.5         |
| No information .....        | 9.2         |             |             | 1.9         | 2.0         | 4.3         |
| Total members .....         | 71.0        | 40.0        | 22.5        | 25.9        | 10.0        | 41.7        |
| Nonmembers .....            | 28.2        | 55.0        | 77.5        | 74.1        | 90.0        | 57.7        |
| No answer .....             | .8          | 5.0         |             |             |             | .6          |
| Total per cent reporting .. | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number reporting ..   | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

The length of membership likewise varied with the different areas. For all five areas combined, only 10 per cent, or 22 farmers, had been members 10 years or more. A rather large percentage, 17.8 per cent, or 58 farmers, had become members in the past 3 years. The Auglaize, Cleveland, and Cincinnati areas had shown the greatest activity in obtaining membership. In the past 3 years, 27 per cent of the farmers interviewed had been obtained as members in the Cincinnati area, 40 per cent in the Auglaize area, and 14 per cent in the Cleveland area. Membership and what constitutes membership were not clear to many of the farmers. They were not sure whether they were members, and in many instances they did not know what was necessary to become a member. Later this will be discussed more fully.

#### EARLY EXPERIENCE WITH COOPERATIVE LIVESTOCK MARKETING

Another interesting phase of this group of farmers interviewed was the period when they had first heard of cooperative livestock marketing being available to them. For most areas in the State, cooperative livestock marketing commenced to become a factor after 1920. During the years 1920-1923 cooperative marketing associations were organized and began operations all over the State. Previous to 1920 there were only a few associations in operation; these were largely in northwestern Ohio. A few cooperative elevators in the northern part of the State marketed livestock cooperatively for the farmers in their community. Hence an analysis of table 9 shows that most of these farmers first heard of cooperative marketing being available to them during the years 1920-1925. Of those interviewed, 40 per cent indicated that they had cooperative marketing made available to them during these years. It is significant to note that a rather large percentage, 17.4 per cent, of this group had

heard of cooperative marketing being available to them only since 1929. They either were not aware of the cooperative activity in their territory or had forgotten about the earlier efforts.

**TABLE 9.—The period when farmers who were interviewed first heard of cooperative livestock marketing being available to them, in five Ohio areas**

|                           | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                           | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Previous to 1920 .....    | 1.5         | .....       | 11.2        | 1.8         | 4.0         | 4.0         |
| 1920-1922 .....           | 7.6         | 40.0        | 21.1        | 7.4         | 26.0        | 15.4        |
| 1923-1925 .....           | 19.8        | 25.0        | 16.9        | 46.3        | 28.0        | 25.2        |
| 1926-1928 .....           | 20.6        | 15.0        | 12.7        | 16.7        | 10.0        | 16.4        |
| 1929-1931 .....           | 12.2        | .....       | 14.1        | 9.3         | 8.0         | 10.7        |
| 1932-1934 .....           | 8.4         | 5.0         | 5.6         | 9.3         | .....       | 6.4         |
| Since 1934 .....          | .....       | 5.0         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .3          |
| Since beginning .....     | 16.0        | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 6.4         |
| Several years ago .....   | 3.1         | .....       | 1.4         | 1.8         | .....       | 1.8         |
| Never heard of them ..... | .....       | .....       | 8.5         | .....       | .....       | 1.8         |
| Do not know .....         | 8.4         | 10.0        | 8.5         | 7.4         | 24.0        | 10.7        |
| No answer .....           | 2.4         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .9          |
| Total per cent. ....      | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....        | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

Only 4 per cent of the farmers interviewed said that they had heard about cooperatives previous to 1920, and a slightly larger number, 6.4 per cent, knew that cooperative marketing had been available to them since its beginning. In each of the five areas, 1920-1925 was the period when a majority of the farmers first heard about cooperatives.

It was rather interesting to interview some of the farmers who had helped organize livestock cooperatives in their own area and who had continued to associate with those organizations up to the present time.

In table 10 are given the sources of information whereby the farmers interviewed first heard of cooperative livestock marketing being available to them. All through this table you will note that there were three principal sources: the Farm Bureau, talking with neighbors and other farmers, and the activity of the cooperative itself. In fact, these three main sources accounted for nearly three-fourths of the information received by the farmers in the very beginning. Of the remaining sources, the most important were the local trucker, newspapers, local meetings, and other cooperatives.

**TABLE 10.—The source of information whereby farmers who were interviewed first heard of cooperative livestock marketing being available to them, in five Ohio areas**

| Source                           | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                  | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Farm Bureau .....                | 24.8        | 95.0        | 16.9        | 38.2        | 78.0        | 37.9        |
| Through the cooperative .....    | 11.7        | .....       | 60.0        | 40.0        | .....       | 23.5        |
| Neighbors and farmers .....      | 21.9        | .....       | .....       | 12.8        | 2.0         | 11.8        |
| Through other cooperatives ..... | 2.2         | .....       | 12.3        | .....       | .....       | 3.4         |
| Other sources* .....             | 28.3        | .....       | 3.1         | 5.4         | .....       | 13.7        |
| Do not know .....                | 8.9         | 5.0         | 3.1         | 3.6         | 2.0         | 5.2         |
| No answer .....                  | 2.2         | .....       | 4.6         | .....       | 18.0        | 4.5         |
| Total per cent. ....             | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....               | 137         | 20          | 65          | 55          | 50          | 327         |

\*Grange, trucker, local meetings, and educational sources.

It must be remembered that these are the sources of information as given by the farmers interviewed. These answers are, of course, what they have remembered and what they may have heard through other sources.

A majority of farmers, as given in table 9, first heard about cooperative marketing during the period 1920-1925, but the period when farmers made their first shipment came a few years later. Of the 326 farmers interviewed in this study there were 293, or 90 per cent, who said that they had made shipments through a cooperative marketing association.

The largest number, 22 per cent, made their first shipment during the 3-year period 1932-1934; another 28 per cent started earlier, 1920-1931. Thus, 50 per cent made their first shipment during the 9-year period 1926-1934. This information is presented in table 11. It is interesting to note that only 1.4 per cent made their first shipment previous to 1920.

TABLE 11.—Periods when farmers who were interviewed made their first shipment through the cooperative livestock marketing associations, in five Ohio areas

|                             | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                             | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Previous to 1920 .....      | .....       | .....       | 3.7         | 4.5         | .....       | 1.4         |
| 1920-1922 .....             | 0.8         | 33.3        | 5.6         | .....       | 6.7         | 4.4         |
| 1923-1925 .....             | 5.3         | 5.6         | 9.3         | 11.4        | 13.4        | 8.2         |
| 1926-1928 .....             | 13.7        | 5.6         | 18.5        | 20.5        | 4.4         | 13.7        |
| 1929-1931 .....             | 15.4        | 5.6         | 18.5        | 20.5        | 4.4         | 14.3        |
| 1932-1934 .....             | 28.2        | 22.2        | 20.3        | 18.2        | 11.1        | 22.2        |
| 1935-1936 .....             | 1.5         | 22.2        | 9.3         | 9.1         | 11.1        | 6.8         |
| Since cooperative started.. | 14.5        | .....       | 1.8         | 13.6        | 17.8        | 11.6        |
| For several years .....     | .....       | 5.5         | .....       | 2.2         | 2.2         | 1.0         |
| Other answers .....         | .....       | .....       | 7.4         | .....       | 17.8        | 4.4         |
| Do not know .....           | 6.9         | .....       | 5.6         | .....       | 2.2         | 4.4         |
| No answer .....             | 13.7        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 8.9         | 7.6         |
| Total per cent .....        | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....          | 131         | 18          | 54          | 44          | 45          | 293         |

In looking at the dates in each area when the first shipments were made, it is found that 28 per cent in the Cincinnati area made their first shipment in the period 1932-1934. In the Auglaize area the time of first shipment was grouped into two periods, 1920-1922 and 1932-1936. In the Cleveland and Columbus areas, the largest percentage of those interviewed made their first shipment during the period 1926-1934. The time of first shipment in the Pickaway area was distributed fairly evenly over the period 1920-1936; no one period was outstandingly higher than another.

It is noticed in table 12 that in the five Ohio areas there were four main factors which had greatly influenced farmers to make their first cooperative shipment. These factors were: first, they were influenced by neighbors, other farmers, and friends; second, some thought they would like to try cooperative marketing; third, they believed in farmers' cooperative organizations; and fourth, some wanted a better market. In the Cleveland and Columbus areas, in addition to the factors just mentioned, there were other reasons of almost equal importance. It should be noticed also in table 12 that in the Auglaize and Pickaway areas, 31.8 per cent and 24.6 per cent, respectively, were influenced to sell cooperatively because they wanted a better market.

Many of the farmers who had marketed cooperatively had not become members merely because they had neglected to do so. Over one-third belonged to this group. This was also typical in every area except in Pickaway, where

TABLE 12.—Factors that influenced farmers who were interviewed to make their first cooperative shipment, in five Ohio areas

| Factors   | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Through neighbors, farmers, friends, and others ..... | 32.4        | .....       | 17.1        | 10.3        | 5.7         | 19.3        |
| Thought they would like to try them .....             | 18.0        | 22.8        | 8.6         | 10.3        | 15.1        | 14.6        |
| Believed in farmers' cooperatives .....               | 19.4        | 18.3        | 4.3         | 10.3        | 7.5         | 12.9        |
| Wanted a better market .....                          | 7.2         | 31.8        | 8.6         | 12.2        | 24.6        | 12.6        |
| Farm Bureau members .....                             | 9.4         | 4.5         | 5.7         | .....       | 7.5         | 6.4         |
| Get rebates .....                                     | 3.5         | 9.1         | 5.7         | 10.3        | 7.5         | 6.1         |
| Other reasons .....                                   | 5.1         | 13.5        | 22.8        | 27.6        | 24.6        | 16.1        |
| No answer .....                                       | 5.0         | .....       | 27.2        | 19.0        | 7.5         | 12.0        |
| Total per cent. ....                                  | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....                                    | 139         | 22          | 70          | 58          | 53          | 342         |

one-third had not become members because they did not know there was any advantage in being a member. In the Pickaway area 27 per cent had formerly been members. An outstanding thing in the Auglaize area was that two-thirds of the nonmembers making shipments through a cooperative did not understand how to become a member (table 13).

TABLE 13.—Reasons why farmers who were interviewed and had marketed cooperatively had not become members of the association, in five Ohio areas

| Reason  | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Neglected to become a member ..                           | 31.3        | 36.4        | 36.4        | 59.5        | 5.6         | 36.5        |
| Did not understand how to become a member .....           | 18.8        | 63.6        | 9.1         | 9.3         | .....       | 14.2        |
| Did not know there was any advantage in being a member .. | 9.3         | .....       | 1.8         | .....       | 33.3        | 10.8        |
| Did not sell enough livestock .....                       | 12.5        | .....       | 10.9        | 25.0        | 11.1        | 9.0         |
| Not satisfied with cooperatives ..                        | .....       | .....       | 1.8         | 3.1         | 11.1        | 2.7         |
| Former member .....                                       | .....       | .....       | 3.6         | 3.1         | 27.7        | 5.4         |
| Other reasons* .....                                      | 28.1        | .....       | 1.8         | .....       | 5.6         | 2.5         |
| No answer .....   | .....       | .....       | 34.6        | .....       | 5.6         | 18.9        |
| Total percentage .....                                    | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....  | 32          | 11          | 55          | 32          | 18          | 148         |

\*Do not know.  
Probably is a member.  
Do not use Farm Bureau products.  
Going to become a member.

If cooperatives want to expand their membership, it is necessary for them to induce farmers to gain experience with the cooperative method. If their first efforts and contacts are satisfactory, undoubtedly many farmers will continue their patronage and eventually may become cooperative members. Table 14 shows that nearly half of the nonmembers were inclined to market cooperatively again. Only one-fifth had definitely decided not to use the cooperative. The remaining number did not give a definite "yes" or "no" answer but were doubtful whether they would market cooperatively in the future. In the Columbus and Pickaway areas a larger percentage of nonmembers was inclined to use the cooperative as a continuing method of marketing livestock.

**TABLE 14.—Farmers who were interviewed and were nonmembers who had thought about marketing their livestock cooperatively in the future, in five Ohio areas**

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 33.3        | 41.7        | 34.6        | 59.5        | 59.1        | 44.5        |
| No.....             | 9.1         | 25.0        | 25.5        | 19.0        | 27.3        | 20.7        |
| No answer.....      | 15.2        | .....       | 3.6         | .....       | .....       | 4.3         |
| Do not know.....    | 9.1         | .....       | 10.9        | 4.8         | 13.6        | 8.5         |
| Perhaps.....        | 33.3        | 33.3        | 23.6        | 9.5         | .....       | 19.5        |
| Probably not.....   | .....       | .....       | 1.8         | 7.2         | .....       | 2.4         |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 33          | 12          | 55          | 42          | 22          | 164         |

### KNOWLEDGE FARMERS HAD OF THEIR COOPERATIVE LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

To give a more complete picture of farmers' ideas and knowledge of, and their attitudes toward cooperative livestock marketing, several tables are presented.

In table 15 it is seen that 49 per cent of the total number interviewed had membership in a livestock association. Of the total number having membership, 7 per cent were members but did not know it.

**TABLE 15.—The number of farmers who were interviewed that had membership in a cooperative livestock marketing association, in five Ohio areas**

|                                  | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                  | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....                         | 72.5        | 40.0        | 22.5        | 22.2        | 10.0        | 41.7        |
| Members but did not know it..... | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 46.0        | 7.1         |
| Former members.....              | 2.3         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .9          |
| No.....                          | 24.4        | 55.0        | 77.5        | 74.1        | 44.0        | 49.1        |
| No answer.....                   | .8          | 5.0         | .....       | 3.7         | .....       | 1.2         |
| Total per cent.....              | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....                | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

In the Cincinnati area 72.5 per cent of the farmers were members of the association. In the Cleveland and Columbus areas only about one-fourth of the farmers interviewed were members. In the Pickaway area an unusual situation occurred. There 10 per cent of the farmers interviewed stated that they were members, but when the membership list was checked, it was found that 46 per cent more of these farmers were members of the association but did not know it. Fifty-six per cent, therefore, were members. This situation shows the need for distribution to the farmers of information about how one becomes a member of the association, and other membership facts.

It was found that farmers in five Ohio areas had held membership in a livestock association for periods varying from 1 to 12 years. Of the total number having membership, 42 per cent had been members from 1 to 3 years (table 16). About 17 per cent had been members from 10 to 12 years. Only 5.2 per cent had been members since the beginning. The length of membership held by farmers in the Cincinnati and Cleveland areas follows rather closely the years just described. In the Columbus area about two-fifths had been



members from 10 to 12 years. The farmers in the Auglaize area, however, had obtained their membership in the past 3 years because of the recent organization of the cooperative in that territory. In Columbus the cooperative first started about 12 years preceding the time of this study. A large number had become members at that time.

TABLE 16.—Number of years that farmers who were interviewed had membership in cooperative livestock marketing associations, in five Ohio areas

| Years a member       | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                      | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| 1-3.....             | 37.8        | 100.0       | 62.5        | 25.0        | 20.0        | 42.6        |
| 4-6.....             | 15.8        | .....       | 25.0        | 16.7        | .....       | 15.4        |
| 7-9.....             | 5.3         | .....       | .....       | 8.3         | .....       | 4.4         |
| 10-12.....           | 15.8        | .....       | 12.5        | 41.7        | 20.0        | 16.9        |
| Since beginning..... | 5.3         | .....       | .....       | .....       | 40.0        | 5.2         |
| Do not know.....     | 5.3         | .....       | .....       | .....       | 20.0        | 3.7         |
| No answer.....       | 14.7        | .....       | .....       | 8.3         | .....       | 11.8        |
| Total per cent.....  | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....    | 95          | 8           | 16          | 12          | 5           | 136         |

Nearly 60 per cent of the farmers interviewed stated that they did not know how membership was obtained in the cooperative livestock marketing association serving their district (table 17). In Pickaway County this percentage rose to slightly more than 80 per cent. In the Auglaize, Cleveland, and Columbus areas from 70 to 75 per cent of the farmers were uninformed about obtaining livestock cooperative membership. In the Cincinnati area a different situation was observed. There approximately 60 per cent of the farmers knew the methods of obtaining membership. This would indicate that farmers in the Cincinnati area were better informed about their association, at least to the extent of knowing how they might join the cooperative. It is interesting to note that about 55 per cent of those that marketed all their livestock cooperatively knew how to obtain membership, whereas of the group that marketed none of their livestock cooperatively, only 15 per cent knew how to obtain membership. Further analysis of table 17 would indicate that the directors and management of the cooperatives serving the Auglaize, Cleveland, Columbus, and Pickaway areas could afford to inform their patrons on methods of obtaining membership and getting better acquainted with the cooperative. At times they assume that former patrons know more about their cooperatives than is shown from actual investigation.

TABLE 17.—The number of farmers who were interviewed who stated they knew how membership was obtained in the cooperative livestock marketing association for their district, in five Ohio areas

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 59.5        | 30.0        | 25.4        | 25.9        | 16.0        | 38.0        |
| No.....             | 32.1        | 70.0        | 74.6        | 74.1        | 82.0        | 58.3        |
| Doubtful.....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 2.0         | .3          |
| No answer.....      | 8.4         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 3.4         |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

To test further the farmer's knowledge of cooperative associations serving him, several questions were asked concerning the obtaining of membership. Unless a farmer knows about a cooperative, how it functions, what it does, how membership is obtained, and the cost of membership, he is not apt to become a member.

It was found in this study that of the total number interviewed, only 112, or 34 per cent, really knew how membership was obtained. Of this 112, 82 per cent were members of a cooperative association, and 17 per cent were nonmembers. This information is given in table 18. About 60 per cent of the "all cooperative" group were members, and only 15 per cent of the "none cooperative" group were members. Of the group that marketed only part through a cooperative, one-half were members of a cooperative marketing association.

TABLE 18.—Explanation of how membership was obtained in the cooperative livestock marketing associations, as given by farmers who stated that they knew how membership was obtained, in five Ohio areas

| Explanation  | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Sign card .....  | 71.8        | 16.7        | 16.6        | .....       | .....       | 40.3        |
| Enclose check or consign .....   | 6.4         | 83.3        | 55.5        | 64.3        | 37.5        | 16.9        |
| Through farm organization .....  | 15.4        | .....       | 5.6         | .....       | .....       | 10.5        |
| Become Farm Bureau member .....  | .....       | .....       | 11.1        | 14.3        | 50.0        | 6.5         |
| Ask for it .....   | 1.3         | .....       | 11.2        | .....       | .....       | 2.4         |
| None .....   | 1.3         | .....       | .....       | 21.4        | 12.5        | .3          |
| Other answers .....  | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 20.2        |
| No answer .....  | 3.8         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 2.4         |
| Total per cent .....   | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number who stated that they knew how membership was obtained .....               | 78          | 6           | 18          | 14          | 8           | 124         |
| Total number who actually knew how membership was obtained .....                       | 74          | 6           | 14          | 11          | 7           | 112         |
| Total number who thought they knew, but did not know how membership was obtained ..... | 4           | .....       | 4           | 3           | 1           | 12          |
| Total number who said that they did not know how membership was obtained .....         | 42          | 14          | 53          | 40          | 42          | 202         |

Of those who stated that they knew how membership was obtained in the Auglaize area, everyone gave the correct explanation. In the Columbus and Cleveland areas slightly more than 75 per cent gave the correct explanation of obtaining membership. In the Cincinnati area about 95 per cent, and in the Pickaway area 88 per cent gave the correct explanation of obtaining membership.

Of all the farmers who stated that they knew how membership in the association was secured, one-half of them said that there was no cost for membership, which was the correct answer. In the Auglaize area everyone knew that there was no cost for membership in that area. In the Pickaway area the opposite extreme occurred. There, no one knew that there was no cost to becoming a member. In the Cincinnati area, 45 per cent said that there was no cost for membership, and in the Columbus and Cleveland areas a larger number, about two-thirds, gave the correct answer.

The preceding analysis shows that these farmers were not clear on the methods of obtaining membership and the cost of membership in livestock cooperatives. If these results are typical of Ohio, then some steps should be taken to correct that situation.

Another test of the knowledge of the interviewed farmers was made by finding out the number who knew the director of the association serving from their respective territories (table 19).

**TABLE 19.—The number of farmers who were interviewed that named correctly the director for their cooperative livestock marketing association from their district, in five Ohio areas**

|                            | Cincinnati  | Auglaize*   | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                            | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Did not name director..... | 77.1        | 100.0       | 100.0       | 98.1        | 100.0       | 90.5        |
| Named director .....       | 20.6        | .....       | .....       | 1.9         | .....       | 8.6         |
| No answer.....             | 2.3         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .9          |
| Total per cent.....        | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....          | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

\*No local board.

Approximately 90 per cent of all the farmers interviewed were unable to name the director from their district. Practically none of the farmers in the Cleveland, Columbus, or Pickaway areas could name their director.

The Auglaize area had no local board of directors, and hence this analysis was not comparable.

The farmers in the Cincinnati area were somewhat better informed. This difference from other areas was slight, however, for only 20 per cent of the farmers interviewed could name their director.

Thirteen per cent of the total number that marketed all cooperatively knew the director from their district, whereas only about 4 per cent of those that did not market anything cooperatively knew the director. This shows the gross lack of information among the farmers as to who is representing them in the cooperative livestock marketing association of their district. It shows further that some effort should be made by the cooperatives to have their membership better informed on the affairs of the association and to give them a better knowledge of its direction.

Of all the farmers interviewed, almost one-half knew none of the employees of their cooperative association. Only 18.5 per cent knew the manager of the association in their area (table 20).

**TABLE 20.—The number of farmers who were interviewed who knew the employees of the cooperative livestock marketing association in their district, in five Ohio areas**

| Employees known          | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                          | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| None.....                | 57.5        | 25.0        | 80.3        | 37.7        | 7.0         | 47.0        |
| Manager.....             | 3.6         | 4.2         | 7.9         | 36.2        | 46.5        | 18.5        |
| One or more.....         | 20.1        | 41.6        | .....       | 8.6         | 31.0        | 17.4        |
| One of the salesmen..... | 10.1        | .....       | 7.9         | 14.5        | .....       | 7.9         |
| Almost all.....          | 4.3         | 25.0        | 1.3         | 1.5         | 15.5        | 6.6         |
| Field man.....           | 2.2         | 4.2         | 2.6         | 1.5         | .....       | 1.8         |
| No answer.....           | 2.2         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .8          |
| Total per cent.....      | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....        | 139         | 24          | 76          | 69          | 71          | 379*        |

\*Some knew more than one employee.

In the Cleveland area 80 per cent knew none of the employees and in the Cincinnati area about three-fifths were not acquainted with the employees. In the Columbus and Pickaway areas, the manager was better known than in any of the other areas.

When one-half of those interviewed say that they do not know any of the employees, either farmers are not paying attention to who works for the organization or are not interested in its affairs; or else the cooperative associations are not trying to inform members about the activities of the association that should be common knowledge to farmers.

#### INFORMATION FARMERS RECEIVE CONCERNING THEIR COOPERATIVE

Cooperatives are continuously faced with the problem of keeping their members and patrons informed of the activities of the cooperative, of getting the right information to their members in a way and manner that is of interest and value to them. It is, therefore, important to analyze the kinds and sources of information about their organization that farmers were obtaining. Table 21 tells where farmers secured their information about the cooperatives in this study.

TABLE 21.—Where farmers who were interviewed obtained information about cooperative livestock associations, in five Ohio areas

| Source                                    | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Hearsay.....                              | 9.2         | 34.6        | 8.2         | 44.8        | 46.8        | 23.9        |
| Letters, newspapers.....                  | 31.2        | 7.7         | 10.6        | 9.0         | 33.9        | 21.8        |
| <i>National Live Stock Producer</i> ..... | 32.4        | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 13.2        |
| Actual experience.....                    | .....       | 46.2        | 4.7         | 7.5         | 16.1        | 7.3         |
| Other sources.....                        | 19.1        | 3.8         | 37.7        | 19.3        | 1.6         | 18.9        |
| None.....                                 | 8.1         | 7.7         | 38.8        | 19.4        | 1.6         | 14.9        |
| Total per cent.....                       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....                         | 173         | 26          | 85          | 67          | 62          | 413         |

Farmers in the five Ohio areas obtained most of their information about cooperative livestock marketing associations from hearsay, letters, newspapers, and the *National Live Stock Producer*. These sources comprise approximately 60 per cent of the methods through which farmers obtained information. When approximately 24 per cent of the information comes through hearsay, it can be concluded that much of the information farmers receive may not be correct. By hearsay, farmers mean the common talk and gossip of the country.

In the Cleveland area almost 40 per cent of those interviewed said in their answers to direct questions that they had not received any information about the association. The farmers in the Pickaway area appeared to be the best informed. Only about 2 per cent of those farmers interviewed had failed to receive any information. In the Cincinnati area the *National Live Stock Producer*, letters, and newspapers were the most important sources of information. The Cincinnati area was the only one in which the *National Live Stock Producer* was an important means of informing farmers. In the Auglaize area actual experience accounted for nearly one-half, and hearsay, for more than one-third of the information. In the Columbus area hearsay was the most common

source of information for the farmers. From an analysis of table 21 it appears that cooperative associations could well give additional thought to influencing the information which farmers term hearsay.

Of the farmers interviewed, about three-fifths had a favorable attitude toward cooperative livestock marketing associations, whereas the remaining number were not so certain of their opinion (table 22). The Pickaway area, where 12 per cent of the farmers had an unfavorable opinion of the association, was the only one of the five areas where such an attitude was found.

TABLE 22.—The opinion that farmers who were interviewed had of cooperative livestock associations, in five Ohio areas

|                     | Cincinnati* | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Favorable.....      | 94.7        | 52.2        | 66.7        | 60.0        | 62.5        | 62.5        |
| Divided.....        |             | 1.5         | 12.5        | 18.0        | 8.7         | 8.7         |
| Doubtful.....       |             |             | 6.3         | 6.0         | 3.3         | 3.3         |
| Unfavorable.....    |             |             |             | 12.0        | 3.3         | 3.3         |
| Do not know.....    |             | 5.3         | 46.3        | 14.5        | 4.0         | 22.2        |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 19          | 67          | 48          | 50          | 184         |             |

\*No report obtained.

Nearly all the farmers in the Auglaize area were in favor of cooperative livestock marketing. In the Cleveland area the farmers were about evenly divided in their opinion; some were favorable, others doubtful. In both the Columbus and Pickaway areas between 60 and 67 per cent had a favorable opinion, and 12 to 18 per cent had a divided opinion.

Information was not obtained from farmers in the Cincinnati area.

As would be expected, a much larger percentage of those who marketed all their livestock cooperatively had a favorable attitude toward cooperative associations than of those who did not market anything cooperatively. As a matter of fact, 78 and 68 per cent of the "all cooperative" and "part cooperative" groups, respectively, had a favorable opinion, whereas only 45 per cent of the "none cooperative" group had such an opinion.

#### PUBLICATIONS AND LETTERS

One way to get information concerning cooperative activities to people in rural areas is through farm papers and other publications of various kinds. As shown in table 23, however, many farmers in Ohio were not receiving any such material from livestock associations. In the Cincinnati area about three-fourths, and in the other areas only a very small percentage, had received publications from associations. Only about 15 per cent of the "none cooperative" group received a publication from the association, whereas almost one-half of the "all cooperative" group received a paper from the association.

The *National Live Stock Producer* seemed to be the publication most commonly received among the farmers interviewed. Of the 105 farmers who had received a publication from the association, 98 per cent indicated that they had received this magazine. And in each individual area except Pickaway a similar percentage indicated likewise. In the Pickaway section one-half indicated that they received the *National Live Stock Producer*, and the other half said that they had received a monthly letter from the association.

TABLE 23.—The percentage of farmers who were interviewed that had received a publication from the association, in five Ohio areas

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 73.3        | 5.0         | 4.2         | 5.6         | 4.0         | 32.2        |
| No.....             | 24.4        | 95.0        | 95.8        | 94.4        | 78.0        | 64.1        |
| Formerly.....       | .8          |             |             |             |             | .3          |
| No answer.....      | 1.5         |             |             |             | 18.0        | 3.4         |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

Of the 105 farmers who received a publication 73 per cent said that the publications they had received were of value, and 10 per cent more indicated that they were of "some" value to them. Only 9.5 per cent of the farmers receiving these papers definitely said that the publications were of no value to them. In the Pickaway area everyone that had received a publication said that it was of no value to them. But in the other areas from two-thirds to all thought that they had received some benefit from the publications.

Of the group of farmers who had received a paper from the association and thought that they had received a benefit, one-third had read all of it. In the Cincinnati and Columbus areas, one-third of this group had read everything in the paper. In the Cleveland area two-thirds and in the Auglaize area everyone of this particular group had read all of it. In the Pickaway area no one indicated how much or what they had read in the paper.

When this group of farmers, those that said they received a benefit from the paper, were asked what subjects they considered to be best, one-third either made no answer or did not know. The specialized type of articles that farmers thought were best and read most were marketing articles and forecasts, livestock articles, and articles concerning cooperative activities.

It has been indicated in the previous discussion that there was a small group that thought the publications they received were of no value. A further analysis of this group revealed that they had read very little in the papers published by the associations. As a matter of fact, only 6.6 per cent of this group had read everything in the papers they received, and 20 per cent more had read small portions in the paper. The remaining farmers in the group, the "no benefit" group, apparently had read very little, if any, in it. This group did not have any idea what things they considered best in the paper. Answers of a varied nature were given. Some said there was no best thing; others said they did not get much out of it.

But this small group may be a very important factor in influencing the kind of hearsay that gets around concerning cooperatives. This is the significant thing about this group that claimed no benefit from the publications they received, rather than how much or how little they read in the paper. Here is a weak link in the cooperatives that deserves constant attention.

The number of farmers that received letters from the association was ascertained to determine further the amount and kind of information that farmers received from their livestock associations. About 40 per cent of those interviewed received letters from the association (table 24). In each area a somewhat different situation occurred. In the Cincinnati area 63 per cent of the farmers said that they had received letters from the association, whereas

in the Auglaize area, the number was only 10 per cent. In the Cleveland, Columbus, and Pickaway areas approximately one-third of the farmers received letters.

**TABLE 24.—The percentage of farmers who were interviewed who received letters from the association, in five Ohio areas**

|                         | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                         | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....                | 62.6        | 10.0        | 29.6        | 27.8        | 30.0        | 41.4        |
| No.....                 | 32.8        | 90.0        | 59.2        | 66.7        | 68.0        | 53.1        |
| Do not know.....        | 2.3         |             | 1.4         |             |             | 1.2         |
| No answer.....          | 2.3         |             |             |             | 2.0         | 1.2         |
| Only check letters..... |             |             | 9.8         | 5.5         |             | 3.1         |
| Total per cent.....     | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....       | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

About 57 per cent of the group that marketed all their livestock through cooperatives had received a letter from the association. Almost one-half of the "part cooperative" group had received a letter, but in the group that sold nothing through the cooperative, only one-fifth had received a letter.

One-third of the farmers had received their last letter from the association within the past 2 years (table 25). It can also be seen from this table that there are various times when farmers in the different areas receive letters from associations. Some received letters weekly or periodically and a small number received occasional letters from the association. An analysis of the dates when letters were received in the Auglaize area would be misleading because of the small number that received letters.

**TABLE 25.—The date when farmers who were interviewed last received letters from their association, in five Ohio areas**

| Date                   | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                        | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Past 2 years.....      | 39.1        | 100.0       | 33.3        | 20.0        | 33.4        | 36.3        |
| Periodically.....      | 6.1         |             | 42.9        | 20.0        | 26.7        | 15.6        |
| When they consign..... | 18.3        |             |             |             |             | 11.1        |
| Weekly.....            | 8.5         |             | 4.8         | 26.7        |             | 8.9         |
| Other answers.....     | 8.5         |             | 9.5         | 33.3        | 33.3        | 14.1        |
| Do not know.....       | 11.0        |             | 9.5         |             |             | 8.1         |
| No answer.....         | 8.5         |             |             |             | 6.6         | 5.9         |
| Total per cent.....    | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....      | 82          | 2           | 21          | 15          | 15          | 135         |

One-fifth of the letters received from the associations were called promotional by the farmers receiving them. Other kinds of letters received were letters of general information, letters with checks, market information, and annual reports. In the Cleveland area about one-third of the letters were notices concerning radio broadcasts (table 26).

It was previously noticed that three-fourths of the farmers who had received a publication from the association thought that it had been of some value to them, but in table 27 less than one-half definitely said that letters from the association were of value to them. Only 15 per cent indicated that the letters were of no value.

TABLE 26.—Kinds of letters that farmers who were interviewed received from cooperative livestock shipping associations, in five Ohio areas

|                            | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                            | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Promotional.....           | 15.4        | 50.0        | 14.3        | 31.2        | 53.3        | 21.7        |
| General.....               | 10.7        | .....       | 19.0        | 18.8        | .....       | 11.5        |
| Letters with check.....    | 17.9        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 6.7         | 11.5        |
| Marketing information..... | 14.3        | .....       | 9.5         | .....       | .....       | 10.2        |
| Annual report.....         | 8.3         | .....       | .....       | 25.0        | 13.3        | 9.4         |
| Weekly newsletter.....     | 6.0         | .....       | 4.8         | 18.8        | 13.3        | 8.0         |
| Other answers.....         | 15.5        | 50.0*       | 47.6†       | 6.2         | 6.7         | 19.0        |
| No answer.....             | 11.9        | .....       | 4.8         | .....       | 6.7         | 8.7         |
| Total per cent.....        | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....          | 84          | 2           | 21          | 16          | 15          | 138         |

\*Loan information.

†Regarding broadcasts.

TABLE 27.—Value of letters received from their association to the farmers interviewed, in five Ohio areas

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 45.5        | .....       | 42.9        | 46.7        | 40.0        | 43.9        |
| No.....             | 8.9         | 100.0       | 9.5         | 33.3        | 20.0        | 14.4        |
| Not much.....       | 5.1         | .....       | 14.3        | 6.7         | .....       | 6.1         |
| Doubtful.....       | 5.1         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 3.0         |
| Do not know.....    | 2.5         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 1.5         |
| No answer.....      | 32.9        | .....       | 28.6        | .....       | 26.7        | 27.3        |
| Some.....           | .....       | .....       | 4.7         | 13.3        | 13.3        | 3.8         |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 79          | 2           | 21          | 15          | 15          | 132         |

From table 27 it is noted that the letters received by the farmers in the Cincinnati and Columbus areas were considered of more importance than those received in the other areas. Of those who received letters, three-fifths of the "all cooperative" group said the letters were of some value to them, whereas only slightly over one-fifth of the "none cooperative" group thought that they received any benefit from the letters.

One of the most important things that made the letters valuable to the farmers who had received them was the cooperative and other information that they contained. This was the outstanding item of importance to the farmers in three of the areas, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus. In the Pickaway section this group of farmers, who received value from the letters, said their benefit came as a result of the educational aspect of the letters. Another important item that seemed to contribute to their value was the market information and news contained in the letters. A small percentage in the Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus areas indicated this to be of value.

The small group, 16 out of 326, that definitely said the letters they received were of no value to them gave several reasons for their attitude toward the letters. Five disliked them because they were purely promotional. This dislike was most important in the Cleveland area. In the Cincinnati section this group of farmers said that the letters were no good after their stock was sold or that the letters were purely promotional and that they received the market reports anyway. In the Auglaize area farmers disliked the letters because they were purely promotional or because they gave too much unnecessary



information. Those in the Columbus section who did not like the letters gave two principal reasons: first, they were not interested in the letters; and second, they received the letters too late for them to be of any value. A large majority of this group in the Pickaway area indicated that they were not interested in the letters.

From the attitudes expressed by the farmers, the cooperatives should include in their letters concrete educational and informative material. They should avoid the promotional aspect, for if the letters make the proper impression on the farmer he probably will react favorably to the association and will become or continue to be a supporter of cooperation in his community.

#### PERSONAL CONTACT—FIELD SERVICE

Cooperatives recognize the importance of personal contact in developing a sound cooperative program. One of the best ways to establish this contact is by a field service program, but such a program is expensive to cooperatives. In this study it was found that nearly four-fifths of the farmers had not been visited or contacted by the association.

In the Auglaize, Columbus, and Pickaway areas, however, a somewhat larger percentage had been visited. In these areas from 30 to 40 per cent of the farmers had been visited by someone from the association (table 28). One-fourth of the "all cooperative" and "part cooperative" groups had been visited by someone from the cooperative, but only 10 per cent of the "none" group had been visited.

TABLE 28.—Visits made by an association employee to farmers who were interviewed, in five Ohio areas

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 19.8        | 30.0        | 4.2         | 30.0        | 40.0        | 21.8        |
| No.....             | 78.6        | 70.0        | 95.8        | 70.0        | 58.0        | 77.3        |
| No answer.....      | 1.6         |             |             |             | 2.0         | .9          |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

One-third of the farmers who were visited by someone from the cooperative said that they had been visited within the past 2 years. A large percentage of the farmers that had been visited did not give the date. This situation occurred mostly in the Cincinnati and Pickaway areas.

In the Cincinnati, Columbus, and Pickaway areas, visits had been made since 1925. In the Cleveland area no visits were made until 1932, and in the Auglaize area visits were not made until 1935 (table 29).

Table 30 shows the various services given by the association to farmers contacted by employees of the association. Marketing services and market information were most often given; almost one-third of the service, according to those interviewed, was to solicit business. In the Columbus area especially was this true. In the Cincinnati area about one-fifth of the visits rendered marketing information service to the farmer. This service was also important in the Auglaize, Columbus, and Pickaway areas. In the Pickaway and Cincinnati areas from 15 to 25 per cent of the farmers stated that no service of any kind was given when the visits were made.

TABLE 29.—The date when farmers who were interviewed were visited by someone from the association, in five Ohio areas

|                                 | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                 | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| 1935 and 1936.....              | 34.7        | 50.0        | 33.4        | 31.4        | 30.0        | 33.8        |
| 1930-1934.....                  | 26.9        | .....       | 66.6        | 37.6        | 15.0        | 25.5        |
| 1925-1929.....                  | 7.6         | .....       | .....       | 18.6        | 5.0         | 8.4         |
| No date given.....              | 23.1        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 30.0        | 16.9        |
| Other answers.....              | 7.7         | 50.0        | .....       | 12.4        | 20.0        | 15.4        |
| Total per cent not visited..... | 80.2        | 70.0        | 95.8        | 70.4        | 60.0        | 78.2        |
| Total per cent visited.....     | 19.8        | 30.0        | 4.2         | 29.6        | 40.0        | 21.8        |
| Total per cent.....             | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number visited....        | 26          | 6           | 3           | 16          | 20          | 71          |

TABLE 30.—Services given by someone from the association to farmers who were interviewed, in five Ohio areas

| Service                      | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                              | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Marketing.....               | 34.6        | 66.7        | 66.7        | 18.7        | 30.0        | 33.8        |
| Solicited business.....      | 10.3        | 33.3        | 33.3        | 56.2        | 40.0        | 31.1        |
| Cooperative information..... | 13.8        | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 5.4         |
| Grading assistance.....      | 10.3        | .....       | .....       | 6.3         | .....       | 5.4         |
| Miscellaneous services.....  | 6.8         | .....       | .....       | 18.8        | 15.0        | 10.8        |
| Gave no information.....     | 24.2        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 15.0        | 13.5        |
| Total per cent.....          | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number given services  | 29          | 6           | 3           | 16          | 20          | 74          |

Most of the visits were made to farmers without the request of the farmer, except in the Pickaway area. There about one-fourth of the farmers made requests. In the other areas studied, from none to 7 per cent of the farmers asked for service or for someone to visit them.

About 10 per cent of the "all cooperative" group, or 6 per cent more than the "none cooperative" group, asked for someone from the association to visit them.

#### LIVESTOCK MEETINGS

Officers and employees of cooperative organizations should try to inform their members about cooperative activities. However, if farmers ever expect to get acquainted with all the available information concerning cooperative organizations, they will have to make considerable effort themselves.

In table 31 is presented some of the information that indicates the extent to which the farmers try to inform themselves about the cooperative livestock marketing associations in their territory. Of the farmers interviewed, 85 per cent said that they had not attended the annual meeting of the association, and in the Auglaize and Cleveland areas no one had attended. It would seem, therefore, that the farmers themselves were not making a very great effort to find out about activities in their own organization. On the other hand, 30 per cent of the farmers interviewed in the Pickaway area turned out for the annual meeting, a greater number than in any other section studied. The percentages of those who had attended the annual meeting in the Cincinnati and Columbus areas were 19 and 9 per cent, respectively.

**TABLE 31.—Percentage of farmers who were interviewed that had attended the annual meeting of their cooperative livestock marketing association, in five Ohio area**

|                     | Cincinnati | Auglaize | Cleveland | Columbus | Pickaway | Total |
|---------------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|
| No.....             | 78.6       | 100.0    | 100.0     | 90.7     | 70.0     | 85.3  |
| Yes.....            | 19.1       | .....    | .....     | 9.3      | 30.0     | 13.8  |
| No answer.....      | 2.3        | .....    | .....     | .....    | .....    | .9    |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0      | 100.0    | 100.0     | 100.0    | 100.0    | 100.0 |
| Total number.....   | 131        | 20       | 71        | 54       | 50       | 326   |

A rather outstanding thing to notice is that only 2.9 per cent of those not marketing cooperatively had attended the annual meeting. Of the "all cooperative" group, 26.8 per cent, which is also very low, had attended

When only a small number are attending annual meetings, as the above analysis shows, it indicates a lack of enthusiasm or a considerable inconvenience for the member to attend, or that the cooperative does not have its membership fully behind it. Attendance at annual meetings and active participation in the activities of the organization help make a successful and educated membership in cooperative organizations.

Slightly over one-half of the farmers who turn out for the meetings had attended them during the past 3 years preceding the interview, whereas only 7.2 per cent had attended all the meetings held in recent years (table 32). In the Columbus area, there appeared to be more interest in meetings that had been held earlier than in those of recent years as in the Cincinnati and Pickaway areas.

**TABLE 32.—Years that farmers who were interviewed had attended the annual meeting, in five Ohio areas**

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| 1927-1932.....      | 5.6         | .....       | .....       | 60.0        | 13.4        | 9.0         |
| 1933-1936.....      | 75.0        | .....       | .....       | 20.0        | 25.7        | 51.5        |
| All of them.....    | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 25.6        | 7.2         |
| Other answers.....  | .....       | .....       | .....       | 20.0        | 20.0        | 16.2        |
| No answer.....      | 19.4        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 13.3        | 16.1        |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | .....       | .....       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 36          | .....       | .....       | 5           | 15          | 56          |

It has been indicated previously that only a very small percentage had attended the annual meeting of their cooperative livestock association. But it is of interest to know that almost 70 per cent of those who had attended thought that those meetings were worth while. In the three areas of Cincinnati, Columbus, and Pickaway a similar percentage thought that the meetings were of value. In the Cincinnati area no one definitely said the meetings were not worth while. In the Pickaway section, a small number, about 13 per cent, definitely said that the meetings were not worth attending, whereas 40 per cent of those who had attended in the Columbus area said that the meetings were not worth while.

Since a very small percentage of farmers attends the annual meetings, cooperatives should make a determined effort to inform all their members of the information furnished at the annual meeting, and of other activities of

particular interest to individual members. They should be informed concerning the election of their directors, who they are, and where they are located. The members should also be told about the volume of business and the financial affairs of their cooperative. From this study it appears that managers and directors can well afford to study more intently this phase of their activities.

To see further the efforts that farmers were making to inform themselves about cooperative associations, the number that had been to the association's office or yards was obtained. Of the total number interviewed, 215, or 66.3 per cent, had been to the yards or offices. A large percentage of those who had been to the offices or yards last visited there during the preceding 3 years.

Approximately three-fourths of the "all cooperative" and "part cooperative" groups and less than one-half of the "none cooperative" group had been to the offices of the cooperatives.

In addition to the annual meeting, all the cooperatives held meetings for livestock producers throughout their marketing areas at different times. Less than 40 per cent of the 326 farmers interviewed remembered that such meetings had been held in their territory (table 33); but in the Pickaway area this percentage was 60 per cent, which was greater than in any of the other areas. In the Auglaize and Columbus associations the opposite situation occurred. There 80 and 78 per cent, respectively, said that no meetings had been held in their county or territory.

TABLE 33.—The percentage of farmers stating the number and kind of livestock association meetings that had been held in counties or territories as reported by farmers who were interviewed, in five Ohio areas

|   | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....  | 34.3        | 15.0        | 42.3        | 22.2        | 60.0        | 36.8        |
| No .....  | 51.1        | 80.0        | 53.5        | 77.8        | 28.0        | 54.3        |
| Do not know.....                                  | 11.5        | 5.0         | 4.2         | .....       | 12.0        | 7.7         |
| Producer representative at<br>other meetings..... | .8          | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .3          |
| No answer.....                                    | 2.3         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | .9          |
| Total per cent.....                               | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....                                 | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |

Forty-two per cent of the "part cooperative" group and 40 per cent of the "all cooperative" group, but only 26.4 per cent of the "none cooperative" group knew that meetings had been held.

When the farmers were asked how many meetings had been held, a wide variety of answers was given. Twenty-eight per cent said several; 16 per cent said that yearly meetings were held; and 16 per cent more replied that they did not know the number. Among other answers given were membership drives, tours, and picnics.

The information in table 34 gives the number of meetings attended and what the farmers thought of the meetings after they had attended them. Thirty-two per cent of those farmers that knew meetings had been held had not attended any of the meetings and 20 per cent made no answer at all. Twenty-six per cent said that they had been to several of the meetings, and 12.7 per cent more had attended only one. A larger percentage in the Columbus and Pickaway areas than in any of the other areas had not attended any of the meetings. The large number in all areas combined, 32 per cent, that had not

attended at all, indicates the need for larger attendance at meetings of livestock associations. Small attendance indicates either an uninterested membership or failure of the organization to try to get members to become interested in the meetings.

TABLE 34.—The percentage of meetings attended and attitude toward the meetings as given by farmers who were interviewed, in five Ohio areas

|  | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| None .....                                       | 28.0        | 33.3        | .....       | 58.3        | 61.3        | 32.5        |
| Several .....                                    | 10.0        | .....       | 66.7        | 16.7        | 19.4        | 26.2        |
| One .....  | 16.0        | .....       | 16.7        | 16.7        | 3.2         | 12.7        |
| Two or more .....                                | 12.0        | 66.7        | 3.3         | 8.3         | 3.2         | 8.7         |
| Do not know .....                                | 6.0         | .....       | 13.3        | .....       | .....       | 5.6         |
| No answer .....                                  | 28.0        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 12.9        | 14.3        |
| Total per cent. ....                             | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number of meetings                         | 50          | 3           | 30          | 12          | 31          | 126         |
| Total number of farmers attending meetings ..... | 45          | 3           | 30          | 12          | 30          | 120         |
| Was it worth while?                              |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Yes .....  | 57.7        | 100.0       | 100.0       | 80.0        | 29.6        | 55.7        |
| Doubtful .....                                   | 15.4        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 3.7         | 7.2         |
| No .....   | .....       | .....       | .....       | 20.0        | .....       | 1.4         |
| Do not remember .....                            | 3.8         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 1.4         |
| No answer .....                                  | 23.1        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 66.7        | 34.3        |
| Total per cent. ....                             | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....                               | 26          | 2           | 10          | 5           | 27          | 70          |

Of those attending livestock meetings in their community, one-fourth had last attended one of the meetings during the past 2 years; 46 per cent made no answer at all. This further points out the poor attendance and without a doubt the lack of interest in livestock marketing meetings. Of those who attended, only 55 per cent said that the meetings were worth while, which would indicate that the others present were not impressed with the meetings. This answer suggests that officers and directors of livestock marketing associations can improve the meetings that they are holding.

#### RADIO

Although meetings of various kinds are very useful in keeping farmers informed about cooperative activities, there are other sources of information that farmers were using. One of these was the radio. Table 35 shows the wide use of the radio in obtaining market information. Seventy-two per cent said that they listened to the radio broadcasts, and an additional 19 per cent said that they listened occasionally. In three of the areas, Auglaize, Columbus, and Pickaway, over 80 per cent listened to the market reports.

The percentage of any one of the "all", "part", and "none" groups that listened to the radio broadcasts varied but little from the other two. About 75 per cent of the "all" and "part" groups listened, and 65 per cent of the "none" group listened to the broadcasts.

Over one-half of those using the broadcasts listened to station WLW. Other stations that were used were WTAM, WHKC, and WOSU. In the Cincinnati area everyone listened to the WLW broadcasts, and in the Auglaize area two-thirds listened to the Cincinnati station. In the Cleveland area nearly

everyone used WTAM. Three-fourths in the Columbus area listened to WHKC, and no one listened to WOSU; in the Pickaway area only 2.5 per cent used WOSU.

TABLE 35.—The percentage of farmers who were interviewed that listened to radio broadcasts, and what they thought of the broadcasts, in five Ohio areas

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 67.1        | 80.0        | 64.8        | 85.2        | 80.0        | 72.4        |
| No.....             | 3.1         | .....       | 2.8         | .....       | 10.0        | 3.4         |
| No radio.....       | 16.0        | 20.0        | .....       | 14.8        | 10.0        | 18.7        |
| Occasionally.....   | 10.7        | .....       | 32.4        | .....       | .....       | 4.3         |
| No answer.....      | 3.1         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 1.2         |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 131         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 326         |
| Do you like them?   |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Yes.....            | 97.1        | 100.0       | 95.8        | 100.0       | 97.5        | 97.6        |
| No.....             | 2.9         | .....       | 4.2         | .....       | .....       | 2.0         |
| No answer.....      | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 2.5         | .4          |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 102         | 16          | 48          | 46          | 40          | 252         |

Of those who used the radio as a means of obtaining information, 97.6 per cent said that they liked the broadcast, and in the Columbus and Auglaize areas all said that they were satisfied with them. In each of the other areas a large percentage indicated likewise.

This analysis shows that farmers are using the radio broadcasts to keep themselves informed on market quotations. Farmers are using them and like them, probably because they are easily available and are up to date.

The largest percentage of those interviewed said that the broadcasts were satisfactory. However, there were some suggestions for the improvement of the broadcasts: (1) an evening report, as the morning report was no good to the farmer; (2) elimination of the surplus detail; (3) a grain report at the same time; and (4) weather report more often.

The farmers who were interviewed in the Cincinnati area were asked which was the better, the association or the United States Department of Agriculture broadcast. The larger number replied that they had no preference between the broadcasts. Those that said the producers' broadcasts were the better gave the following reasons: more information, a full and more detailed market report, and the cooperative organization. The number preferring the United States Department of Agriculture report was small.

#### WHAT INFORMATION FARMERS WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE

In the preceding pages there have been pointed out the kind and amount of information available to members and patrons of the associations included in this study. After this information had been obtained from the farmers interviewed, each one was asked what information he would like to receive from the cooperative association. Since the preceding analysis shows that the farmers included in this study were not well informed about their cooperative livestock associations, it was not only amazing, but difficult to understand, when more than half of the farmers stated that they wanted no information concerning their cooperatives (table 36).

TABLE 36.—Information that farmers who were interviewed would like to receive concerning the livestock associations, in five Ohio areas

|  | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| None .....                                     | 51.9        | 42.9        | 54.9        | 66.7        | 68.0        | 56.8        |
| Market information, prices and forecasts ..... | 9.9         | 33.3        | 22.0        | 25.9        | 8.0         | 16.7        |
| About association activities ..                | 7.6         | .....       | 22.0        | 3.7         | 6.0         | 10.1        |
| Feeder information .....                       | 1.6         | .....       | .....       | .....       | 2.0         | .9          |
| Other .....                                    | 3.8         | 23.8        | .....       | 3.7         | 10.0        | 4.9         |
| Do not know .....                              | 21.4        | .....       | 1.1         | .....       | 2.0         | 8.6         |
| No answer .....                                | 3.8         | .....       | .....       | .....       | 4.0         | 2.0         |
| Total per cent. ....                           | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....                             | 131         | 21          | 91          | 54          | 50          | 347         |

Only a small number, about 10 per cent, wanted more information concerning the activities of their cooperative. Approximately 17 per cent wanted the cooperative to furnish them more market information, especially on prices and forecasts. The remainder either gave other answers or did not know what they wanted.

In every area except Auglaize, over 50 per cent of those interviewed said that they did not want any information. In the Auglaize, Cleveland, and Columbus areas from one-fourth to one-third said that they wanted market information. An outstanding thing in the Cincinnati area was that 21 per cent said that they did not know what information they wanted.

This analysis would seem to indicate that livestock producers in Ohio are not very anxious to secure information concerning the activities of cooperative organizations.

#### EVALUATION OF THE ASSOCIATION BY FARMERS

People in rural areas usually place a value on community organizations of various kinds. In this study an attempt has been made to find what value farmers in these selected areas put on cooperative livestock marketing.

In this study it was found that 72 per cent of the total number interviewed thought that the association had been of value to them (table 37). A very decided difference of opinion was noticed between the "all", "part", and "none" groups. In the "all" and "part" groups, 89 per cent and 81.6 per cent, respectively, said that the association had been of value to them, but only 46.1 per cent of the group that did not market any livestock through a cooperative thought that they had received some benefit from the association. It is interesting to observe, however, that such a large percentage of a group that had not marketed cooperatively thought that such an organization was of value to them.

Nearly one-half of this group (those who stated that the association was of value to them) thought that the value they received came as a result of the influence that associations had had on prices or on selling costs, and 17 per cent more said that they benefited because associations worked for the farmers' interests. The influence the cooperatives have had on prices ranked first in the farmers' estimate of benefits in each of the five areas.

In view of what farmers indicated in this study, if cooperative livestock associations are to be of value in the opinion of the farmer, they will somehow have to influence the price that farmers receive.

TABLE 37.—The reasons given why the associations had been of value to farmers who were interviewed, in five Ohio areas

| Reason  | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Influenced prices .....   | 29.6        | 68.4        | 38.3        | 43.7        | 34.9        | 36.7        |
| Worked for farmers' interest ..   | 15.9        | 15.8        | 34.0        | 8.3         | 14.0        | 17.3        |
| Made rebates.....   | 15.9        | .....       | 4.3         | 20.8        | 4.7         | 12.1        |
| Lowered and influenced prices.  | 9.8         | 10.5        | 10.6        | 16.7        | 4.7         | 10.4        |
| Gave market information .....   | 6.8         | .....       | 4.3         | 6.2         | .....       | 4.8         |
| Convenience.....  | .....       | .....       | .....       | 4.3         | 18.6        | 3.5         |
| Other reasons .....   | 17.4        | 5.3         | 8.5         | .....       | 11.6        | 11.4        |
| No answer.....  | 4.6         | .....       | .....       | .....       | 11.5        | 3.8         |
| Total per cent.....   | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 132         | 19          | 47          | 48          | 43          | 289         |
| Total per cent of farmers who thought the association had been of value ..... | 78.6        | 75.0        | 60.6        | 74.1        | 70.         | 72.4        |
| Total number of farmers who thought the association had been of value .....   | 103         | 15          | 42          | 40          | 35          | 235         |

These same farmers indicated by a large majority, 71.4 per cent, that the cooperative association had been of value to the community, and only 11.7 per cent thought that the cooperatives had not been worth while. About the same percentages of those who were interviewed and thought that the association had been of value to the individual also thought that the association had been of value to the community. These farmers who were interviewed could give only their own opinion of the value of the cooperative association to their community. Hence, we would expect it to be very much the same as the value to them as individuals. A check on table 37 shows this to be true. The largest differences were in the Pickaway, Columbus, and Auglaize areas. About the same reasons were advanced for the value of cooperatives to the community as were given for the individual. These were influencing prices, working for the farmers' interest, rebates, and lowered and influenced costs.

Apparently the farmers interviewed in the Pickaway area thought that the association was of more value to individuals than to the community as a whole, whereas in the Columbus and Auglaize areas the reverse was true.

Individuals or groups of people who form an opinion of any organization, either favorable or unfavorable, are usually influenced by certain definite factors. Forty-two per cent of those interviewed in this study (table 38) formed their opinions of the association from the prices or services that they received from the cooperative. Among other things that influenced farmers in forming their opinion of the association were reading material, acquaintance, and experience. It can be noted that in the Columbus and Pickaway areas the farmers who were interviewed based 70 to 75 per cent of their opinions on price or services obtained. In the Cincinnati area 44 per cent based their opinions on experience, reading, or acquaintance.

From this analysis it seems that if associations are to have farmers maintain a favorable attitude toward cooperative activities, two things will have to be done: first, cooperative associations will have to be able to obtain livestock prices for the farmers that are equal to or better than prices from other competing buyers; and second, cooperatives will have to educate their membership through experience, reading material, and acquaintance.



TABLE 38.—Factors influencing farmers who were interviewed in forming their opinion of cooperative associations, in five Ohio areas

|   | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Prices received or services obtained .....  | 16.2        | 36.4        | 41.6        | 70.0        | 75.5        | 41.8        |
| Experience, reading, and acquaintance ..... | 44.0        | 9.1         | 1.3         | .....       | 8.2         | 18.9        |
| Cooperative benefits obtained .....         | 14.0        | 9.1         | 1.3         | 7.1         | 8.2         | 8.8         |
| Competitive aspect .....                    | .....       | 22.7        | 13.0        | 8.6         | .....       | 5.9         |
| Neighbors, truckers, and others .....       | 3.7         | .....       | 1.3         | .....       | .....       | 1.7         |
| Other reasons .....                         | 3.7         | .....       | 2.5         | 7.1         | 2.0         | 3.7         |
| Do not know .....                           | 7.4         | .....       | 22.1        | 4.3         | 6.1         | 9.3         |
| No answer .....                             | 11.0        | 22.7        | 16.9        | 2.9         | .....       | 9.9         |
| Total per cent .....                        | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number .....                          | 136         | 22          | 77          | 70          | 49          | 354         |

Of the 326 farmers interviewed, 34.4 per cent, or 112, had received patronage refunds from cooperative livestock associations. Of the five areas, patronage dividends had only been received very extensively in the Cincinnati territory, where 71.8 per cent of the farmers had received them. In sections other than Cincinnati, less than 5 per cent had received any refunds from their association. In the Cincinnati area one-half of the total amount was received between the years 1933 and 1935, and another 20 per cent was received from 1930 to 1932.

In the Cincinnati section almost one-third of those receiving had received from \$1.00 to \$4.99, and 17 per cent more had received from \$5.00 to \$9.99, whereas another 17 per cent did not know how much they had received.

Almost 60 per cent of those interviewed were in favor of patronage refunds, and only 4 per cent were definitely against them. The remaining farmers did not know or gave no answer. In the Cincinnati section, where farmers have had more experience with refunds, it is interesting to note that three-fourths of those interviewed were favorable, whereas only 5 per cent were definitely unfavorable. The remaining number did not know or gave no answer.

### SUGGESTIONS AND CRITICISMS

After the attitude of those interviewed toward cooperative livestock marketing had been obtained, these farmers were then asked for suggestions and criticisms of cooperative livestock marketing.

Table 39 shows that of the farmers interviewed, only 13 per cent thought that the cooperative associations should be giving or sponsoring additional services and activities, and that 35 per cent said that the associations should not extend their activities or services. Nearly one-half of those interviewed said that they did not know whether the association should undertake any more services or activities. Many of the farmers in answering this question thought that they could not give satisfactory answers because they were not familiar with the policies and problems of the associations.

It should be noticed that in the Cincinnati and Pickaway areas a large percentage said that the cooperative association should not undertake any more activities. In the Auglaize, Cleveland, and Columbus areas the largest percentage of those interviewed did not know.

**TABLE 39.—Opinion that farmers who were interviewed had of increasing the activities or services of the cooperative association, in five Ohio areas**

|                     | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                     | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Yes.....            | 19.8        | 25.0        | 2.8         | 14.8        | 4.0         | 13.1        |
| No, or none.....    | 59.5        | .....       | .....       | .....       | 76.0        | 35.2        |
| Do not know.....    | 12.8        | 75.0        | 97.2        | 85.2        | 20.0        | 48.6        |
| No answer.....      | 7.9         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 3.1         |
| Total per cent..... | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number.....   | 126         | 20          | 71          | 54          | 50          | 321         |

The farmers that said more activities should be undertaken suggested the following things: better grading facilities, yards owned by the association, an educational program, and market forecasts.

Those who were interviewed were asked whether any of the activities of cooperative associations should be eliminated. When the answers were checked, it was found that 47 per cent made no answer; 37 per cent said "no"; and only 10 per cent of those interviewed said that some of the activities should be eliminated. It was found that the largest percentage either said they did not know or made no answer at all. These two results tend to show that farmers had given little thought to the question of activities and services rendered by cooperative associations, or that members were not well enough informed to answer this question.

It is interesting to observe the answers given to these questions in each of the five areas. In the Auglaize and Pickaway areas a much larger percentage than in any of the other areas wanted some of the services eliminated, whereas in the Cincinnati and Pickaway areas a larger percentage wanted the services maintained. This analysis indicates that farmers in the Pickaway area had given more thought to activities and services offered by cooperative associations. In three of the areas, Auglaize, Cleveland, and Columbus, more than three-fourths answered by saying that they did not know whether they wanted any of the activities or services eliminated.

The group that said some of the activities should be eliminated mentioned the following things: eliminate insurance charges, cut commissions on small livestock, do not sell by auction, and stop grading.

When this group of 326 farmers were asked to criticize the cooperative livestock shipping associations, 71.5 per cent had no criticism of the association, and 23.6 per cent had a criticism to offer. It is interesting to notice that in every area the percentage having no criticisms greatly exceeded the percentage that had a criticism of the association. In the Auglaize and Pickaway areas, 35 and 42 per cent, respectively, thought that there was something wrong with the association.

In the five areas combined, the most important criticism was that costs were too high. One-fifth gave this criticism (table 40). Other important criticisms were: unsatisfactory grading, unsatisfactory prices or sales, and dissatisfaction with the method of marketing livestock. Another criticism was dissatisfaction with employees.

These criticisms were of varying importance in different areas. In the Auglaize, Columbus, and Pickaway areas, the three areas having the largest percentage of criticism, the farmers believed that costs were too high. In the Cleveland area the criticisms were equally divided between dissatisfaction with

employees and methods of marketing livestock; and in the Cincinnati section criticisms were evenly divided between prices or unsatisfactory sales and unsatisfactory grading. Under the latter were too much shrink, selling out too quickly, discourteous salesmen, too much buyer collusion, and other complaints. Almost every criticism was of an individual nature, although many concerned grading and problems connected with it.

TABLE 40.—Criticisms given by farmers who were interviewed of the cooperative associations, in five Ohio areas

| Criticism                                       | Cincinnati  | Auglaize    | Cleveland   | Columbus    | Pickaway    | Total       |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> | <i>Pct.</i> |
| Costs too high .....                            | 12.2        | 22.2        | 12.5        | 36.8        | 25.0        | 20.6        |
| Prices or sales unsatisfactory ..               | 22.0        | .....       | 12.5        | 10.5        | 10.0        | 14.4        |
| Dissatisfied with employees .....               | 12.2        | 11.1        | 25.0        | 10.5        | 20.0        | 14.4        |
| Grading unsatisfactory .....                    | 22.0        | 11.1        | .....       | .....       | 5.0         | 11.4        |
| Disapprove method of marketing livestock .....  | 7.3         | 11.1        | 25.0        | 21.1        | 5.0         | 11.4        |
| Poor information .....                          | 2.4         | .....       | 12.5        | .....       | .....       | 2.1         |
| Records improperly handled ..                   | 2.4         | .....       | .....       | .....       | .....       | 1.0         |
| Others.....                                     | 7.3         | 33.4        | .....       | 21.1        | 35.0        | 17.5        |
| Total per cent.....                             | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       | 100.0       |
| Total number of criticisms....                  | 41          | 9           | 8           | 19          | 20          | 97          |
| Total number of farmers having criticisms ..... | 26          | 7           | 8           | 15          | 21          | 77          |

Cooperatives should be especially alert to all criticisms. Of course, some cannot be avoided, but the management and employees of cooperatives should "lean over backward" to explain and clear up any misunderstandings that may develop in the course of their business dealings. Although only one-fourth of all the farmers interviewed had criticisms, this group is rather large, and if their criticisms are not met and explained satisfactorily, such criticism will travel all over the community. Therefore, cooperatives should keep a watchful eye and attentive ear toward all criticisms and move quickly to correct them.

## CONCLUSION

Cooperative agencies should continuously be alert to the attitude of farmers in their marketing areas. This study points out that farmers may have an attitude quite different from the general opinion of the cooperative leaders.

There were three principal groups of farmers from the standpoint of the operation of the cooperative. These were of about equal importance. First was the group that marketed nothing cooperatively; another group of importance was composed of those farmers who marketed everything cooperatively; and the third group was the in-between farmer, or the "in-and-out", who chose to market cooperatively when and as he saw fit. With this latter group the cooperative has the opportunity to increase its volume and to win over many farmers to a loyal or "all cooperative" group.

It is well for cooperative leaders to consider that all kinds of farmers make up the membership of cooperatives. There may be many classifications, but one which includes most of the farmers is as follows:

1. Very well satisfied with the cooperative
2. Intelligent and well informed
3. Loyal and had a preference for the cooperative
4. Easily influenced by others
5. Not well informed
6. Dissatisfied—had difficulty with the cooperative
7. Peculiar and odd farmers
8. Retired—not engaged actively in farming
9. Those who had poor powers of analysis
10. Those who had lost faith with the cooperative movement
11. Those who were radical

When the membership of the cooperative is composed of such farmers as classified, cooperatives must give considerable thought in their day-to-day operations so that the members and patrons will have a clear understanding of the policies and problems facing the cooperative. If members and patrons do not have this understanding, the cooperative will be slower to attain the position many leaders and farmers desire for the cooperative movement in the future.

Without repeating, the various points brought out in the earlier part of the study show that the management of cooperatives should give more attention and effort to the knowledge that farmers have of their cooperative association. They should keep in mind that the individual factor, the information obtained by word of mouth, the contacts made by the farmer from day to day, probably have more influence on his attitude than is generally realized. Since the farmers, as was found in this study, had a resistance toward information put out by the cooperative, it would seem that more thought and more skill and effort must be used to get an understanding membership.

After studying the various tables, one is more convinced than ever that the smaller, or local, associations have a better opportunity of keeping their members informed than has a large organization whose offices are many miles away from the farmer-member. Likewise, an association that has local facilities, even though the main offices may be some distance away, has a much better chance to keep farmers informed and educated about the cooperative program.

As a result of this study, it would seem that all cooperatives should give farmers more information of an educational nature, and stay away from the propaganda type of information. It would seem that information of a factual nature, educational and well timed, is necessary to get farmers interested. Owing to the competition at the present time, farmers, as well as anyone else, are apt to throw aside the undesirable, unpopular material that comes to their attention.

This study brought out the fact that farmers do not have a very clear-cut knowledge of the association, who operates it, and who directs it. They were very poorly informed on the names of the directors and their respective territories, and a very small percentage knew the director himself.

Cooperative livestock associations usually have one or two important contacts with the farmer when he does market through them: the cooperative usually writes a check, and this is handled by the farmer. It would seem, therefore, that this is an opportunity, if thought were directed to it, to give each consignor of livestock up-to-date information that would only take a few minutes to read.

To most farmers, a cooperative association which is 30 or more miles away is a rather impersonal thing. Since it is, they look upon the cooperative most of the time as another competitive organization handling their products. Therefore, it becomes the job of the cooperative to have the members generally realize that it is not just another organization, but that it is a typical cooperative (providing it is), owned, operated, and managed by the farmers and for their own benefit. It would seem that as a result of this study cooperatives must give serious thought to the following points:

1. Associations should arouse the desire of farmers for more information concerning cooperatives. This should result in more farmers' becoming interested and participating in cooperative organizations.
2. Cooperatives should furnish more information that is acceptable to farmers, for example, information that is educational in nature, not propaganda.
3. The information that farmers receive should be continuous and distributed at regular intervals.
4. Cooperatives should secure a mutual understanding between the members and management of the organization concerning the problems confronting the association.
5. When cooperatives do not have personal contact with their members, every means available within the organization's income should be devised to bring about a general acceptance of the cooperative. With such acceptance, cooperatives can then expect more participation by farmers and an enlarging and growing membership.
6. Cooperatives must perform a more efficient service for their patrons, one that is equal to or better than that offered by competitive agencies engaged in the same service. This, of course, presupposes that the cooperative is organized fundamentally right, has good personnel and sound management, and is performing an excellent service.